

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant	Boyce
Serial Number	10/092,237
Filed	March 6, 2002
Confirmation No.	8680
Art Unit	1633
Examiner	Wehbe
Title	<b>SURGICAL DEVICE FOR SKIN THERAPY OR TESTING</b>
Attorney Docket No.	074057.7

Cincinnati OH 45202

July 6, 2009

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Further to the June 3, 2009 personal Interview, Applicant submits the required Interview Summary.

Applicant thanks Examiners Wehbe, Woitach, Nguyen, and Kim (respectively, per Applicant's understanding, the current Examiner now replacing Examiner Kaushal, the Supervisory Primary Examiner, the Examiner introduced as having experience in skin applications, and the Examiner introduced as the technical expert that the Board, at the Oral Hearing, recommended be present) for the courtesy of a June 3, 2009 personal interview (with Examiner Wehbe participating by telephone) with Applicant and his undersigned representative.

As required, Applicant states the substance of the interview was the Board's recommendation to obtain assistance from

...a bio-tech specialist [who] gives you a party who's not been involved all the way through prosecution and may help both you and the Examiner take that step back that you need and approach it in a way and maybe work as, you know, as an arbitrator, on [sic a] language would be mutually acceptable to both parties...

...[in order to] figure out what the appropriate language is that gets us away from Niels [Krejci] towards this, right. And if we can – if you can sit down, perhaps draw this out on a white board over in the Corps, and say this is what we have and we have support for that, but you've got to have the support for it. And this is what's going on with the prior art, now it's just a matter of what kind of language is comfortable to both parties to get this case through the — right? (March 3, 2009 transcript of February 3, 2009 Oral Hearing, pp. 23-24).

Applicant's representative agrees with the June 4, 2009 Interview Summary, but did not receive "a copy of the Boyce reference" during the interview, contrary to the last sentence. Applicant appreciated and accepted Examiner Wehbe's offer to submit a draft Amendment by e-mail and awaits the Examiner's comment.

This Interview Summary is timely filed since July 3, 2009 was a Federal holiday and July 4, 2009 fell on a Saturday.

Respectfully submitted,  
THOMPSON HINE LLP

/Beverly A. Lyman/

Beverly A. Lyman, Ph.D.  
Reg. No. 41,961

Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 8801  
Dayton OH 45402  
513 352 6596  
513 241 4771 facsimile  
738093